## South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force

Office of the Executive Director
FIU, University Park, OE 165, Miami Florida 33199
Phone 305-348-1665 Fax 305-348-1667

## Issues for Discussion WG August 12, 2002

Overall there have been a lot of comments provided to the OED on the last draft and we think you will find this a much better document.

## August 12, 2002 Focus of working group review

- 1. Editorial recommendations that were factual corrections, including updated information and inaccuracies have been synthesized and incorporated into this draft. We received several comments on how to refer to the ecosystem. In general, the document uses the definition from WRDA 1996 (South Florida Ecosystem) when referring to the ecosystem. There are a few places in the document where "Greater Everglades Ecosystem" is used, as the editor felt it was more descriptive, or was information from another document.
- The Task Force directed OED staff and members to develop a short preamble to the strategy that would assist the reader in clarifying the differences between this strategy, the CERP, and the CERP programmatic regulations. The enclosed preamble has been substantially changed and should be reviewed in its entirety.
- 3. A proposal for a new section in goal 1 regarding conflicting hydrology goals first proposed by Dexter Lehtinen of the Miccosukee tribe is still under development. Representatives for the Tribe and DOI are working on proposed new language. This will be sent to you separately.
- 4. Goal 3 as per Task Force request has been substantively rewritten. Because of the amount of text changes to this section it should be read and reviewed in its entirety.

## Issue for discussion on Goal 3:

The Task Force made a decision to elevate the environmental justice and equity component of goal 3 to the guiding principles of the document and to include these topics as part of each goal, rather than as a subgoal. The attached draft is consistent with the Task Force decision. At the July 15, 2002 Working Group meeting, the Working Group voted to reverse the Task Force decision. This issue needs additional Working Group discussion.